

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed April 22, 2004. In order to correct typographical errors, Applicants amend Claims 1 and 20 and the claims that were previously numbered as Claims 53 and 54. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Section 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 5-6, 8-9, 13-15, 20, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,487,424 issued to Kraft et al. ("Kraft") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,009,444 issued to Chen ("Chen"). Claim 1 recites:

A method for providing selectable characters within a user interface comprising:

determining an operating mode of a communication device;

receiving an input associated with a selected key;

determining a group of characters associated with the selected key based on the operating mode;

displaying a first character of the group of characters associated with the selected key within a first portion of the user interface;

displaying the group of characters associated with the selected key proximal to the first character within a second portion of the user interface;

highlighting the first character displayed within the second portion of the user interface;

receiving a second input associated with the selected key;

highlighting a second character within the group of characters associated with the selected key in response to the second input; and

displaying the second character within the first portion of the user interface.

Kraft and *Chen*, both alone and in combination, fail to disclose every element of Claim 1. Claim 1 recites "highlighting a second character within the group of characters associated with the selected key in response to the second input[.]" As the Examiner concedes, "*Kraft* does not specifically teach . . . highlighting a second character within a group of characters associated with the selected key in response to the second input." *Office Action*, p. 3. Applicants respectfully note that the Examiner fails to address this element with respect to *Chen* or any other reference. Moreover, *Chen* does not in fact disclose any highlighting of characters. Therefore, *Kraft* and *Chen* both alone and in combination fail to disclose "highlighting a second character within a group of characters associated with the selected key in response to the second input" as recited by Claim 1.

The Examiner also asserts that "*Kraft* teaches displaying a first character of a group of characters associated with the selected key within a first portion of the user interface; displaying the group of characters associated with the selected key proximal to the first character within a second portion of the user interface; and highlighting a first character displayed within the second portion of the user interface (see col. 14, lines 65-67, col. 15, lines 1-4 & 7-12, and FIG. 7)." *Office Action*, p. 3. Applicants respectfully dispute this reading of *Kraft*. Applicants note that the referenced portion of *Kraft* states only that "[w]hen the letter 'h' is entered by means of the alphanumeric keypad 7, the candidate list appears in the second display part 22 with one of the characters highlighted by the cursor 23." Col. 14, line 65 - col. 15, line 1. Thus, it is the candidate list that is displayed in the second display part. Therefore,

to the extent that the Examiner is equating the alphanumeric keys of *Kraft* with the "selected key" as recited by Claim 1, Applicants respectfully note that the characters in the candidate list are not, however, associated with the alphanumeric keys. As *Kraft* notes, "characters with a pronunciation matching the entered Latin letters are placed at the top of the candidate list displayed in the second display part 22, while candidates not matching so well are shown at the bottom of the list" and "[c]andidates not matching are left out of the list." Col. 14, ll. 3-8. Thus, the candidate list that is displayed in the second display part is a list of non-Latin characters that match, to a varying degree, the pronunciation of a string of Latin characters the user has entered. Therefore, to the extent that the characters displayed in the second display part are associated with anything they are associated with the *string of Latin characters already entered*, and not with the alphanumeric keys. Therefore, *Kraft* also does not disclose, teach, or suggest "displaying the group of characters associated with the selected key proximal to the first character within a second portion of the user interface" as recited by Claim 1. *Chen* does not remedy this omission as *Chen* does not disclose "a second portion of [a] user interface" or "[a] group of characters associated with [a] selected key."

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully note that, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must identify within the references some suggestion or motivation to combine the references. M.P.E.P. § 2143. Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner provides no such suggestion or motivation. With respect to the proposed combination, the Examiner states only that:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to specifically include receiving a second input associated with the selected key, or highlighting a second character within a group of characters associated with the selected key in response to the second input because this would allow for an improved method for inputting text through a keypad having fewer keystrokes.

Office Action, p. 3.

These conclusory statements however identify no motivation or suggestion within the references to combine the references as required by M.P.E.P. § 2143 and amount to hindsight reconstruction of Claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that, not only has the Examiner failed to identify in the references any motivation or suggestion for making the proposed combination, but the references in fact teach away from such a combination. For example, a key benefit of the device of *Kraft* is that the device allows the user to limit the display of non-Latin characters by entering a series of Latin characters. In the device of *Kraft*, pressing a selected key a second time results in the entry of another Latin character which, in turn, reduces the list of candidates shown. Col. 15, ll. 4-6. By contrast, *Chen* discloses a device that sequentially displays an ordered set of Chinese phonetic symbols as the user presses the same telephone key repeatedly. Col 3, ll. 11-15. Thus, combining the device of *Kraft* with *Chen* as proposed by the Examiner would not in fact reduce the number of keystrokes required for the user to input text as the Examiner suggests.

Office Action, p. 3.

In particular, in the modified *Kraft* device, the result of the user pressing an alphanumeric key a second time would

be to display the next character in the candidate set instead of reducing the number of characters in the candidate set as originally intended by *Kraft*. As *Kraft* notes, "[t]he list of candidate characters will therefore appear to be endless, if means for reducing the amount of candidates is not provided." Col. 13, ll. 20-22. Consequently, with no mechanism by which to reduce the candidate set, the number of keystrokes required to input non-Latin characters would increase dramatically over the unmodified device of *Kraft*, as the user would have to navigate a seemingly endless list of candidate characters to select the desired character. Thus, one skilled in the art would clearly lack the motivation to combine *Kraft* and *Chen* as the Examiner proposes. As a result, the proposed combination is improper for at least this reason.

Additionally, because the proposed combination eliminates the sole mechanism by which a user of the *Kraft* device could reduce the candidate list, the proposed combination would change the principle of operation of the *Kraft* device. As the M.P.E.P. states "[i]f the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, the teaching of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious." M.P.E.P. § 2134.02. Therefore, the proposed combination is also improper for at least this reason.

As a result, *Kraft* and *Chen*, both alone and in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of Claim 1. Furthermore, the proposed combination of *Kraft* and *Chen* is improper. Claim 1 is thus allowable for at least these reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 1 and its dependents.

Although of differing scope from Claim 1, Claims 8, 15, and 20 include elements that, for reasons substantially

similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1, are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the cited references. Claims 8, 15, and 20 are allowable for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 8, 15, and 20 and their respective dependents.

The Examiner rejects Claims 4, 11, 18 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kraft* in view of *Chen* and U.S. Patent No. 6,646,573 issued to *Kushler* et al. ("Kushler"). Claims 4, 11, 18, and 23 depend from Claim 1, 8, 15, and 20, respectively, which have all been shown above to be allowable. Claims 4, 11, 18, and 23 are thus allowable for at least these reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 4, 11, 18, and 23.

The Examiner rejects Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kraft* in view of *Chen* and U.S. Patent No. 5,818,437 issued to *Grover* et al. ("Grover"). Claim 12 depends from Claim 8, which has been shown above to be allowable. Claim 12 is thus allowable for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 12.

The Examiner rejects Claims 7, 19, 25-26, 41-43, and 48-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kraft* in view of *Chen* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,674,372 issued to *Ouyang* ("Ouyang").

Claim 41 recites:

A method for providing selectable characters within a user interface comprising:
determining an operating mode of a communication device;
receiving a first input associated with a selected key;

determining a group of characters associated with the selected key based on the operating mode; and

displaying the group of characters associated with the selected key within a user interface;

receiving a second input associated with the selected key;

determining a time interval between receiving the first input and receiving the second input; and

calculating a time-out period based on the time interval.

Kraft, Chen, and Ouyang, both alone and in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of Claim 41. As discussed above with respect to Claim 1, neither *Kraft* nor *Chen* discloses "displaying the group of characters associated with the selected key within a user interface[.]" *Ouyang* does not remedy this omission as *Ouyang* also does not disclose any displaying of characters associated with a selected key. Thus, the cited references fail to disclose "displaying the group of characters associated with the selected key within a user interface" as recited by Claim 41.

Additionally, *Kraft, Chen, and Ouyang* fail to disclose "calculating a time-out period based on the time interval." As the Examiner concedes, *Kraft* does not disclose "calculating a time-out period based on the time interval." *Office Action*, p. 10. *Chen* does not remedy this omission as *Chen* does not disclose any form of time intervals. With respect to *Ouyang*, the Examiner asserts that "*Ouyang* teaches determining a time interval between receiving the first input and receiving the second input; and calculating a time-out period based on the time interval (see col. 6, lines 17-20 and col. 8, lines 5-9)." *Office Action*, p. 10. The first cited portion of *Ouyang* states merely that "when .5 second or more elapses without keys pressed down after a user presses down one key, the timer

decides that the user has completely input one character or symbol to notify an end of input to a system." Col. 6, lines 17-20. The second cited portion states that:

When it is checked that there is no stop signal, the routing proceeds to Step S306 where it is checked if an input waiting time exceeds 0.5 second or not. When the input waiting time does not exceed 0.5 second, the routine returns to the Step S301 where it is verified whether there is a user's input. When the input waiting time is equal to or more than 0.5 second, the routine proceeds to Step S307.

Col. 8, ll. 3-9.

Applicants respectfully note that the Examiner fails to specifically identify the elements described in the cited portions of *Ouyang* that the Examiner believes represent the "time interval" and the "time-out period." To whatever extent the Examiner may be asserting that the time elapsing "without keys pressed down after a user presses down one key" represents the "time interval" of Claim 41 and the .5 second limit described by *Ouyang* represents the "time-out period" of Claim 41, the .5 second limit of *Ouyang* is not "calculated based on" the time elapsing without keys pressed. Thus, *Ouyang* also does not disclose "calculating a time-out period based on the time interval" as recited by Claim 41.

As a result, *Kraft*, *Chen*, and *Ouyang*, alone and in combination, fail to disclose every element of Claim 41. Additionally, as discussed above with respect to Claim 1, the proposed combination of *Kraft* and *Chen* is improper. Claim 41 is thus allowable for at least these reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 41 and its dependents.

Although of differing scope from Claim 41, Claims 48 and 49 include elements that, for reasons substantially similar to those discussed with respect to Claim 41, are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by *Kraft*, *Chen*, and *Ouyang*, alone or in combination. Thus, the cited references do not disclose every element of Claims 48 and 49. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 48 and 49, and their respective dependents.

The Examiner rejects Claims 27-29, 31-32, and 34-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kraft* in view of *Kushler*. Claim 27 recites:

A method for providing selectable characters within a user interface comprising:
determining an operating mode of a communication device;
receiving a first input associated with a selected key;
determining a group of characters associated with the selected key based on the operating mode;
displaying a first character of the group of characters associated with the selected key within a first portion of the user interface;
displaying a cursor within the first portion of the user interface, the cursor positioned centrally relative to a second portion of the user interface and highlighting the first character; and
horizontally displaying the group of characters associated with the selected key proximal to the first character within a second portion of the user interface.

Kraft and *Kushler*, both alone and in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of Claim 27. *Kraft* does not disclose "displaying the group of characters associated with the selected key . . . within a second portion of the user interface" As discussed above with respect to Claim 1, *Kraft* displays a group of non-Latin characters

associated with the entirety of the string of Latin characters entered by the user. Thus, *Kraft* does not disclose "displaying the group of characters associated with the selected key," horizontally or otherwise.

Kushler also does not disclose "displaying the group of characters associated with the selected key . . . within a second portion of the user interface." Instead, *Kushler* discloses a display in which "the most likely word corresponding to the input sequence is displayed in some distinguishing format." Col. 14, ll. 14-16. Thus, *Kushler* displays a word corresponding to the entire input sequence and does not "display[] the group of characters associated with the selected key" as recited by Claim 27.

Furthermore, as the Examiner concedes "Kraft does not specifically teach . . . displaying the group of characters associated with the selected key within a second portion of a user interface." *Office Action*, p. 13. Thus, *Kraft* does not disclose "displaying the group of characters associated with the selected key proximal to the first character within a second portion of the user interface." *Kushler* also does not disclose displaying any group of characters "proximal to the first character within a second portion of the user interface" as recited by Claim 27. Applicants respectfully note that the Examiner fails to address this element, with respect to *Kushler*, in rejecting Claim 27. Nonetheless, *Kushler* does not disclose displaying any group of characters "proximal to the first character within a second portion of the user interface." For example, Figure 2B of *Kushler* clearly indicates that text displayed in text region 66 is not "proximal to" words displayed in selection list region 77. Thus, *Kraft* and *Kushler* both fail to disclose "displaying the group of characters associated with the selected key proximal

to the first character within a second portion of the user interface" as recited by Claim 27.

As a result, *Kraft* and *Kushler*, both alone and in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of Claim 27. Claim 27 is thus allowable for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 27 and its dependents.

Although of differing scope from Claim 27, Claims 31, 36, and 37 include elements that, for reasons substantially similar to those discussed with respect to Claim 27, are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by *Kraft* and *Kushler*, alone or in combination. Thus, the cited references do not disclose every element of Claims 31, 36, and 37. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 31, 36, and 37, and their respective dependents.

The Examiner rejects Claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kraft* in view of *Kushler* and *Grover*. Claim 33 depends from Claim 31, which has been shown above to be allowable. Claim 33 is thus allowable for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 33.

The Examiner rejects Claims 30 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kraft* in view of *Chen*, *Kushler*, and *Ouyang*. Claim 30 and 39 depend from Claims 27 and 37, respectively, which have both been shown above to be allowable. Claims 30 and 39 are thus allowable for at least these reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 30 and 39.

The Examiner rejects Claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kraft* in view of *Kushler* and *Ouyang*. Claim 40 depends from Claim 37, which has been shown above to be allowable. Claim 40 is thus allowable for at least this

reason. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 40.

The Examiner rejects Claims 44-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kraft* in view of *Ouyang*. Although of differing scope from Claim 41, Claim 44 includes elements that, for reasons substantially similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 41, are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by *Kraft* and *Ouyang*, alone or in combination. Thus, the cited references do not disclose every element of Claim 44. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 44 and its dependents.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objects to previously-numbered Claims 53 and 54 due to numbering errors associated with these Claims. Applicants renumber previously-numbered Claims 53 and 54 as Claims 50 and 51, respectively, thereby addressing the Examiner's objection to these claims. Applicants respectfully note that Applicants have surrendered no subject matter as a result of making these amendments.

Conclusions

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending Claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Samir A. Bhavsar
Reg. No. 41,617

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
(214) 953-6581

Date: July 22, 2004

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer Number:

05073